APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/782,985	02/20/2004	Robert S. Kolman	10030895-1	7147

7590   03/20/2008

AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
Legal Department, DL 429
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 7599
Loveland, CO 80537-0599

EXAMINER
PILLAI, NAMITHA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/20/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/782,985	KOLMAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NAMITHA PILLAI	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 December 2007</u>.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are rejected.
7)☒ Claim(s) <u>11</u> is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>20 February 2004</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   This Office action is responsive to the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed under 37 CFR §1.53(d) on 12/3/07.   Applicants have properly set forth the RCE, which has been entered into the application, and an examination on the merits follows herewith. The Examiner acknowledges Applicant's amendments to claims 1 and 11 and the addition of new claims 18 and 19.   All pending claims have been rejected in view of the prior arts disclosed. Claim 11 has been objected to. Claims 1-10 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim Objections

2.   Claim 11 is objected to because of the following informalities: "**a map structure**" (line 4 of claim 11) must be corrected to "**said map structure**" to refer to the map structure in line 2 of the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3.   Claims 1-10 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims do not positively recite that the graphical user interface is displayed on a display screen but merely recites that a graphical user interface can be *displayable* on a display screen. Therefore the claims do not fall under a statutory category.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4.   Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,111,561 (Brandau et al.), herein referred to as Brandau.

Referring to claim 1, Brandau discloses a graphical user interface displayable on a display screen (column 2, lines 42-46) comprising a panning window interface (Figure 2 and column 2, lines 13-23). Brandau discloses that included in this panning window interface is a high-level map structure panel for displaying a map structure on a first image scale (Figure 2 and column 2, lines 13-23), where the Overview window panel is the high-level map structure. Brandau also discloses a panning window which is movable from a first position in the high-level map structure panel to a second position in the high-level map structure panel by way of a continuous panning motion from the first position to the second position to select a sub-portion of the displayed map structure (column 2, lines 56-64). The panner represents the panning window which when the user drags is movable from a first position to a second position in the Overview panel. This dragging is a continuous panning motion which selects a sub-portion of the displayed Overview map data. Brandau discloses a detailed sub-structure panel which displays the selected sub-portion of the map structure on a second image scale greater than the first image scale (Figure 2 and column 2, lines 19-26). The Detail window panel displays the selected sub-portion of the Overview window on a scale that is more detailed than the first image scale.

Referring to claim 11, Brandau discloses a method for simultaneously displaying a high-level structure of a map structure and a detailed portion of the map structure on a display screen (Figure 2 and column 2, lines 13-26 and lines 42-46). The Overview window and the Detail window are displayed simultaneously with the Overview window being the high-level structure and the Detail window displaying the detailed portion of the map structure. Brandau discloses displaying a map structure on a first image scale in a first area of a display screen (Figure 2 and column 2, lines 13-23). Brandau discloses providing a panning window which is movable from a first position in the high-level map structure panel to a second position in the high-level map structure panel by way of a continuous panning motion from the first position to the second position to select a sub-portion of the displayed map structure (column 2, lines 56-64). The panner represents the panning window which when the user drags is movable from a first position to a second position in the Overview panel. This dragging is a continuous panning motion which selects a sub-portion of the displayed Overview map data. Brandau discloses displaying the selected sub-portion of the map structure on a second image scale greater than the first image scale in a second area of the display screen (Figure 2 and column 2, lines 19-26). The Detail window panel displays the selected sub-portion of the Overview window on a scale that is more detailed than the first image scale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 2-10 and 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandau and U. S. Publication No. 2004/0006425 A1 (Wood et al.), herein referred to as Wood.

        Referring to claim 2, Brandau does not disclose a graphical switch that allows the panning window interface to be activated or inactivated. Wood discloses a graphical means through which the user can switch to activate the panning window interface or to inactivate the panning window interface (Figure 7 and page 4, paragraph 36, lines 1-6), where the selection of the menu item allows for switching between activation and inactivation of the panning window interface. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Wood to disclose a graphical switch that allows the panning window interface to be activated or inactivated. Providing a graphical means through which the user can choose to activate or inactive the panning window interface provides more user control over the interface. The user of Brandau's display would benefit from having control over the activation status of the panning window interface when the interface is provided with large amounts of data that needs attention at any particular time. When the user would desire to switch the panning window interface activation status, the switch can occur in response to the user's desire. This would motivate Brandau to learn from Wood to implement a graphical switch means. Therefore, one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been

motivated to learn from Wood to disclose a graphical switch that allows the panning

window interface to be activated or inactivated.

Referring to claim 3, Brandau discloses distinct elements are highlighted in the

map structure (column 1, lines 17-18 and lines 28-31) but does not disclose that the

panning window interface comprises a search and highlight function, the search and

highlight function allowing input of a search criteria and highlighting elements in the map

structure displayed in the high-level map structure panel that meet the search criteria.

Wood discloses a search and highlight function where in response to search criteria

input by the user for displaying and identifying distinct data, these elements are

highlighted in the map structure displayed in the high-level map structure panel that

meet the search criteria (Figure 12 and page 5, paragraph 44, lines 11-30). The

interface of Figure 12 allows the user to input search criteria associated with distinct

elements where selection of the elements of the menu in Figure 12 results in searching

and highlighting of these same elements in the map structure of Wood. It would have

been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Wood that

the panning window interface comprises a search and highlight function, the search and

highlight function allowing input of a search criteria and highlighting elements in the map

structure displayed in the high-level map structure panel that meet the search criteria.

Brandau discloses an interface where network elements are configured and further

highlighted in order for the user to identify specific elements within a system. The

configuration and management of this network would benefit from a search and

highlight functionality that would allow for the user to search and identify specific

elements within a large and clustered network. This provides motivation for Brandau to

learn from Wood. Therefore, one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would

have been motivated to learn from Wood that the panning window interface comprises a

search and highlight function, the search and highlight function allowing input of a

search criteria and highlighting elements in the map structure displayed in the high-level

map structure panel that meet the search criteria.

Referring to claim 4, Brandau and Wood disclose that the search and highlight

function allows input of a plurality of search criteria and highlights elements in the map

structure displayed in the high-level map structure panel that meet the search criteria

(Wood, Figure 12 and page 5, paragraph 44, lines 11-30), where the search menu

display of Figure 12 provides a plurality of search criteria that can be selected through

inputs by the user with these elements being highlighted in the map structure.

Referring to claim 5, Brandau and Wood disclose that the search and highlight

function visually differentiates highlights generated according to respective search

criteria (Brandau, column 1, lines 27-30), where the combination of Brandau and Wood

disclose highlighting elements in response to respective search criteria. The

combination of Brandau and Wood also discloses that the highlighted elements are

color coded based on the distinct elements in the network structure there being a

visually different highlight means based on the elements in the network map structure

and the status of these elements.

Referring to claim 6, Brandau and Wood disclose a graphical switch that allows

the search and highlight function to be activated or inactivated (Wood, page 5,

paragraph 44, lines 1-3), where a graphical means is provided to switch to activating

access to the search and highlight function.

Referring to claim 7, Brandau discloses highlighting distinct elements in the

network structure (column 1, lines 17-18 and lines 28-31) but Brandau does not disclose

that the panning window interface comprises a highlight function that allows input of a

highlight selection criteria and highlighting elements in the map structure displayed in

the high-level map structure panel that meet the highlight selection criteria. Wood

discloses a highlight function which allows input of a highlight selection criteria in

response to which elements can be highlighted in the map structure displayed in the

high-level map structure panel that meet the highlight selection criteria (Figure 12 and

page 5, paragraph 44, lines 11-30). The selection criteria input into the menu of Figure

12 results in highlighting of these criteria in the map structure of Wood. It would have

been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Wood that

the highlight function allows input of a highlight selection criteria and highlighting

elements in the map structure displayed in the high-level map structure panel that meet

the highlight selection criteria. Brandau discloses an interface where network elements

are configured and further highlighted in order for the user to identify specific elements

within a system. The configuration and management of this network would benefit from

highlighting elements in response to a highlight selection criteria functionality that would

allow for the user to search and identify specific elements within a large and clustered

network. This provides motivation for Brandau to learn from Wood. Therefore, one

skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to learn from

Wood that the highlight function allows input of a highlight selection criteria and

highlighting elements in the map structure displayed in the high-level map structure

panel that meet the highlight selection criteria.

Referring to claim 8, Brandau and Wood disclose that the highlight function

allows input of a plurality of highlight selection criteria and highlights elements in the

map structure displayed in the high-level map structure panel that meet the highlight

selection criteria (Wood, Figure 12 and page 5, paragraph 44, lines 11-30), where the

search menu display of Figure 12 provides a plurality of highlight selection criteria that

can be selected through inputs by the user with these elements being highlighted in the

map structure.

Referring to claim 9, Brandau and Wood disclose that the highlight function

visually differentiates elements highlighted according to different respective highlight

selection criteria (Brandau, column 1, lines 27-30), where the combination of Brandau

and Wood disclose highlighting elements in response to respective highlight selection

criteria. The combination of Brandau and Wood also discloses that the highlighted

elements are color coded based on the distinct elements in the network structure there

being a visually different highlight means based on the elements in the network map

structure and the status of these elements.

Referring to claim 10, Brandau and Wood disclose a graphical switch that allows

the highlight function to be activated or inactivated (Wood, page 5, paragraph 44, lines

1-3), where a graphical means is provided to switch to activating access to the highlight

function.

Referring to claim 12, Brandau discloses highlighting elements in the map

structure (column 1, lines 17-18 and lines 28-31) but does not disclose displaying a

selectable search and highlight function that accepts search criteria input and highlights

elements in the map structure displayed in the first area of the display screen that meet

the search criteria input. Wood discloses displaying a selectable search criteria and

highlight function that accepts search criteria input and highlights elements in the map

structure displayed in the first area of the display screen that meet the search criteria

input (Figure 12 and page 5, paragraph 44, lines 11-30). The interface of Figure 12

allows the user to input search criteria associated with distinct elements where selection

of the elements of the menu in Figure 12 results in searching and highlighting of these

same elements in the map structure of Wood. It would have been obvious to one skilled

in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Wood displaying a selectable search

and highlight function that accepts search criteria input and highlights elements in the

map structure displayed in the first area of the display screen that meet the search

criteria input. Brandau discloses an interface where network elements are configured

and further highlighted in order for the user to identify specific elements within a system.

The configuration and management of this network would benefit from a search and

highlight functionality that would allow for the user to search and identify specific

elements within a large and clustered network. This provides motivation for Brandau to

learn from Wood. Therefore, one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would

have been motivated to learn from Wood displaying a selectable search and highlight

function that accepts search criteria input and highlights elements in the map structure

displayed in the first area of the display screen that meet the search criteria input.

Referring to claim 13, Brandau and Wood disclose that the search and highlight

function accepts simultaneous input of a plurality of search criteria and highlights

elements in the map structure displayed in the first area of the display screen that meet

the search criteria input (Wood, Figure 12 and page 5, paragraph 44, lines 11-30),

where the search menu display of Figure 12 provides a plurality of search criteria that

can be selected through inputs by the user with these elements being highlighted in the

map structure.

Referring to claim 14, Brandau and Wood disclose visually differentiating

highlighted elements highlighted according to different respective search criteria

(Brandau, column 1, lines 27-30), where the combination of Brandau and Wood

disclose highlighting elements in response to respective search criteria. The

combination of Brandau and Wood also discloses that the highlighted elements are

color coded based on the distinct elements in the network structure there being a

visually different highlight means based on the elements in the network map structure

and the status of these elements.

Referring to claim 15, Brandau discloses displaying highlighted elements in the

map structure (column 1, lines 17-18 and lines 28-31) but does not disclose a highlight

function that accepts highlight selection criteria input and highlights elements in the map

structure displayed in the first area of the display screen that meet the highlight

selection criteria input. Wood discloses a highlight function that accepts highlight

selection criteria input and highlights elements in the map structure displayed in the first

area of the display screen that meet the highlight selection criteria input (Figure 12 and

page 5, paragraph 44, lines 11-30). The selection criteria input into the menu of Figure

12 results in highlighting of these criteria in the map structure of Wood. It would have

been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Wood a

highlight function that accepts highlight selection criteria input and highlights elements in

the map structure displayed in the first area of the display screen that meet the highlight

selection criteria input. Brandau discloses an interface where network elements are

configured and further highlighted in order for the user to identify specific elements

within a system. The configuration and management of this network would benefit from

highlighting elements in response to a highlight selection criteria functionality that would

allow for the user to search and identify specific elements within a large and clustered

network. This provides motivation for Brandau to learn from Wood. Therefore, one

skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to learn from

Wood a highlight function that accepts highlight selection criteria input and highlights

elements in the map structure displayed in the first area of the display screen that meet

the highlight selection criteria input.

Referring to claim 16, Brandau and Wood disclose that the highlight function

accepts simultaneous input of a plurality of highlight selection criteria and highlights

elements in the map structure displayed in the first area of the display screen that meet

the highlight selection input (Wood, Figure 12 and page 5, paragraph 44, lines 11-30),

where the search menu display of Figure 12 provides a plurality of highlight selection

criteria that can be selected simultaneously through inputs by the user with these

elements being highlighted in the map structure.

Referring to claim 17, Brandau and Wood disclose visually differentiating

highlighted elements highlighted according to different respective highlight selection

criteria (Brandau, column 1, lines 27-30), where the combination of Brandau and Wood

disclose highlighting elements in response to respective highlight selection criteria. The

combination of Brandau and Wood also discloses that the highlighted elements are

color coded based on the distinct elements in the network structure there being a

visually different highlight means based on the elements in the network map structure

and the status of these elements.

Referring to claim 18, Brandau discloses that the continuous panning motion

comprises a drag action (column 2, lines 61-64) but does not disclose a drop action.

Wood discloses a continuous panning motion that involves dragging and dropping

action (page 4, paragraph 39, lines 1-4), where clicking and moving comprises the

dragging action and releasing the mouse button comprises the drop action. It would

have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from

Wood that the continuous panning motion comprises a drop action. Both Brandau and

Wood disclose traversing a display area by carrying out a continuous panning motion

involving drag action with Wood further describing a drop action. The drop action is

carried out in Wood in response to the drag action where after dragging, the drop action

is carried out to end the interaction process. In response to the mouse click, initiating

the dragging, the drop action would occur when the mouse is unclicked. Therefore in

view of the drag operation in Brandau, the drop action would be obvious. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Wood that the continuous panning motion comprises a drop action.

Referring to claim 19, Brandau discloses that the continuous panning motion comprises a drag action (column 2, lines 61-64) but does not disclose a drop action. Wood discloses a continuous panning motion that involves dragging and dropping action (page 4, paragraph 39, lines 1-4), where clicking and moving comprises the dragging action and releasing the mouse button comprises the drop action. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Wood that the continuous panning motion comprises a drop action. Both Brandau and Wood disclose traversing a display area by carrying out a continuous panning motion involving drag action with Wood further describing a drop action. The drop action is carried out in Wood in response to the drag action where after dragging, the drop action is carried out to end the interaction process. In response to the mouse click, initiating the dragging, the drop action would occur when the mouse is unclicked. Therefore in view of the drag operation in Brandau, the drop action would be obvious. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to learn from Wood that the continuous panning motion comprises a drop action.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7.   The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered

pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(c) to

consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited

therein teach the method for displaying a graphical user interface with panning means.

Responses to this action should be submitted as per the options cited below: The

United States Patent and Trademark Office requires most patent related

correspondence to be: a) faxed to the Central Fax number (571-273-8300) b) hand

carried or delivered to the Customer Service Window (located at the Randolph Building,

401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314), c) mailed to the mailing address set forth in

37 CFR 1.1 (e.g., P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450), or d) transmitted to the

Office using the Office's Electronic Filing System.

In responding to this office action, please note that the examiner of record for the

above-identified application has changed. Please direct all future correspondence to

Namitha Pillai whose telephone number is (571) 272-4054. The examiner can normally

be reached from 8:30 AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Doon Chow can be reached on (571) 272-7767.

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file.

PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a

possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record

includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35

U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published

in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG

89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is

(571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Namitha Pillai
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2173
March 14, 2008

/Namitha Pillai/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2173